

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/370,706 | 08/09/1999 | JOHN MCGARRY | C99-018 | 8405 |
| 23459 | 7590 09/09/2002 | | | |
| ARTHUR J. | O'DEA | | EXAM | INER |
| | RPORATION | | STONE, JONATHAN D | |
| ONE VISION NATICK MA | DRIVE 01760-2077 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2176 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 09/09/2002 | <u> </u> |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | 112 | | | |
|---|---|--|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| | <u>-</u> | | | /V | | | |
| • | Office Assiss Commons | 09/370,706 | MCGARRY, JOHN | , | | | |
| • | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | · The MAILING DATE of this communication | Jonathan D Stone | 2176 | S | | | |
| Period for | Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHC THE M - Extens after S - If the - If NO - Failur | DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I I AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 BIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory is to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be the ply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of this period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI by statute, cause the application to become A lie mailing date of this communication, even if | reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commur RANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | nication. | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed of | | | | | | |
| 2a)🗓 | | ☐ This action is non-final. | | orite is | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the applic | | | | | | |
| • | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w | vithdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5)[| Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) | Claim(s) are subject to restriction | and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)□ | 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) 🗌 | 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 11) | The proposed drawing correction filed or | n is: a) L approved b) L | disapproved by the Examinor. | | | | |
| | If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| | The oath or declaration is objected to by | r the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Priority | under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | c 440(a) (d) or (f) | | | | |
| | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for | r foreign priority under 35 U.S.C | , g 119(a)-(u) or (i). | | | | |
| a) | ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority do | cuments have been received. | A | | | | |
| | 2 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| * | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) | See the attached detailed of the detailed of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| | a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 5) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | |
| İ | | | | | | | |
| 2) X Not | nt(s) ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pap | 0-948) 5) Notice | ew Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). of Informal Patent Application (PTO-1 | 52) | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/370,706 Page 2

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the patent application *LARGE DATA SET STORAGE AND*DISPLAY FOR ELECTRONIC SPREADSHEETS APPLIED TO MACHINE VISION, as filed on 8/9/1999.

2. Independent claims 1-3 and dependent claims 4-8 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler et al.
- 5. With respect to independent claim 1, in the abstract Adler discloses an electronic spreadsheet having objects and formulas within the cells. Adler discloses (column 4, line 72) the inclusion of an object-oriented extensible software scripting language with which the user can (column 4, line 14) program new types of objects into the interpreter, define the operations that can be performed on these objects, and use these objects within the spreadsheet. Adler's invention includes (column 5, line 17) means for storing each object and each formula associated with each cell. In the abstract Adler describes the invention as associating a result, obtained during the evaluating procedure, with each cell associated with each formula operating on the

Application/Control Number: 09/370,706

Art Unit: 2176

object. Adler does not disclose an object-oriented spreadsheet in which the objects provide storage and functions and a single value is returned by the functions. However, Adler's extensible scripting language provides the capability of creating function-specific objects. The present invention recites a single-method object providing storage and functions returning single values. The present invention's object could be one of Adler's objects with the above-specified parameters. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Adler's extensible scripting language in order to produce a comparable object and utilize it in the spreadsheet. This would have achieved equivalent results for the present invention's claimed single-method objects.

Adler describes (column 7, line 48) an invention that includes a means for displaying objects, and/or the results from the evaluation of a formula, in a plurality of formats selectable by the user based on what the user most desires. Adler does not disclose a data display buffer that displays its contents under a variably transparent spreadsheet grid. However, based on Adler's description it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an option resulting in the transparency of a portion or the entirety of the grid. Adler's invention calls for the display of images, graphs, and other visual objects. Such objects are commonly viewed in their own white space or in a proper viewing area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, especially if applying Adler's invention to an area with a concentration on image analysis, to create a proper viewing area by changing the opaqueness of the gridlines to enhance the viewability of the displayed data.

Art Unit: 2176

Adler further discloses an invention (column 5, line 48) having a visual presentation displayed to the user in response to signals corresponding to user input signals as well as other data control signals. This is equivalent to the present invention's claimed means for selectively displaying data content corresponding to a selected cell.

- 6. With respect to independent claim 2, the rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein. In addition, Adler provides for large data sets by defining (column 1, line 38) an object as being any data associated with a cell in the form of scalar values (integers, real numbers, strings, etc.) or more complex elements (video, images, etc.).
- 7. With respect to independent claim 3, the rejection of independent claims 1 and 2 are incorporated herein. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that an image, machine vision or otherwise, constitutes a large data set.
- 8. With respect to dependent claim 4, Adler describes (column 7, line 48) an invention that includes a means for displaying objects, and/or the results from the evaluation of a formula, in a plurality of formats selectable by the user based on what the user most desires. The present invention recites a transparent electronic spreadsheet that is adjustably transparent. Based on Adler's description it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an option resulting in the transparency of a portion of or the entirety of the grid, especially when displaying images, graphs, etc. It would have also been obvious to one

Application/Control Number: 09/370,706

Art Unit: 2176

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the option of adjustable transparency. This would allow the user to maintain a visualization of the grid, while gaining the advantage of a better viewing area for the visual object.

Page 5

- 9. With respect to dependent claim 5, Adler discloses (column 3, line 66) an invention that permits the user to input data through the use of standard computer input and pointing devices (i.e., keyboard, mouse, trackball, joystick, touchscreen, etc.). Further, the preferred embodiment is described (column 9, line 44) as having a keyboard for data entry and a mouse for pointing. Adler points out (column 9, line 39) that any components of similar functionality are acceptable. The mouse, trackball, and touchscreen are explicitly listed, but a joystick provides the same functionality and is inherently included.
- With respect to dependent claim 6, Adler discloses (column 3, line 66) an invention 10. that permits the user to input data through the use of standard computer input and pointing devices (i.e., keyboard, mouse, trackball, joystick, touchscreen, etc.). Further, the preferred embodiment is described (column 9, line 44) as having a keyboard for data entry and a mouse for pointing.
- Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler et al in 11. view of Iwasaki et al (USPN 4992781 – filing date 2/19/1991).

Page 6

Art Unit: 2176

12. With respect to dependent claim 7, the rejection of claim 3 above is incorporated herein. Adler does not disclose the superposition of displayed images. However, Iwasaki discloses an image synthesizer that allows the viewing of multiple images, these images being displayed such that the individual source images appear superposed and transparent to each other. The present invention recites a method wherein an image includes a superposition of an object image, and a graphical analysis of the object image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize Adler's extensible object-oriented scripting to add a graphical analysis function and to include Iwasaki's image superposition display to show the analysis with the image. This would have served to add analysis to the software and at the same time create an easily viewable area in which to place the analysis.

- 13. Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler et al in view of Iwasaki et al (USPN 4992781 filing date 2/19/1991), and in futher view of Mastering Excel 97 4th ed. (Chester and Alden, © 1997).
- 14. With respect to dependent claim 8, it was common in the art at the time of the invention to include different methods of graphical analysis on spreadsheets, such as histograms, pie charts, scatter plots, etc. Neither Adler nor Iwasaki discloses using histograms for histograms for graphical analysis of data. However, the *Mastering Excel 97 4th ed.* teaches (pp. 351-354) a chart wizard in which data is selected to automatically generate a histogram, or other equivalent graphical analysis. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include histograms in Adler's and Iwasaki's inventions as a

Application/Control Number: 09/370,706

Art Unit: 2176

Page 7

method for graphical analysis of data. Such a modification would have served to provide the user with a better analysis of the data in the spreadsheet and access to a graphical analysis of the data.

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to present invention's disclosure.

Anderson et al

U.S. Patent No. 5416895

issued 5/16/1995

filed 4/8/1992

Salas et al

U.S. Patent No. 5317686

issued 5/31/1994

filed 3/10/1993

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed at Jonathan Stone, who can be reached by telephone at (703) 305-7854. Normal contact times are M-F, 8-4:30.

17. Upon an unsuccessful attempt at contacting the examiner, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, may be reached at (703) 308-5186 M-Th, 8-5:00. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for after final communications.

18. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

JDS 8/26/2002 HÉÁTHER R. HERNDON SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100